

The Rights and Duties of Parents

MOST REV. E. J. MCCARTHY, D.D.

Reprinted from the Toronto "Catholic Register"

AS the family is a natural institution of Divine origin, a provident Creator must have given it all the rights and duties, means and safeguards necessary for its well-being. The child enters the world in a helpless condition, and it requires constant and careful attention for many subsequent years. It has wondrous gifts and latent possibilities, but it needs the care and protection of others to develop these gifts and to realize these possibilities. Its physical, intellectual, moral and religious faculties are dormant, and they must be aroused and trained by external agencies. At Baptism the germ of the supernatural is implanted in the soul and that too demands care and cultivation. Equipped with such precious gifts, both natural and supernatural, the child is placed at the mercy of its fellow-beings. Weak and helpless as it certainly is, its feeble cry nevertheless can pierce the clouds. It has a claim which, if defeated, calls to Heaven for vengeance. Every infant has a right to a normal development, else God would have failed to make sufficient provision for the "lord of creation." Since every right involves a corresponding duty, there is a strict obligation somewhere to rear and educate the child. On whom does it rest? Obviously it rests with the parents first and most of all.

As a consequence of procreation, the parents are strictly bound to preserve the life, and to secure the welfare both temporal and spiritual, of their progeny. For this end the Creator has given the parents an inborn affection for their children. For this end He has sanctioned the unity and indissolubility of Matrimony. For this end He has raised a natural contract to the dignity of a Sacrament. For this same noble purpose He has instilled into the child an instinctive love and reverence for its parents, which makes it look to them as its natural protectors and its best educators. In virtue of a sacramental contract Christian parents are strictly bound to procure for their offspring a physical, a mental, a moral and a religious

education sufficient for their welfare both in this world and in the next. From this obligation they cannot be dispensed. While the general principle is clear, it is not easy to determine, in detail and in particular cases, the extent of the obligation and the application of the principle. The amount of education to be given depends largely on circumstances, especially on the rank and means of parents, and on the educational facilities to be found in particular localities. It is safe to say in general that parents are obliged to provide for their children such a physical development as will enable them to make an honest living, and such a mental training as is well calculated to insure success in the ordinary pursuits of life.

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

As to the moral and religious education of children, greater care is required on the part of parents. There is a moral contagion as well as a physical, and vigilant parents should guard against both. They should protect the innocence of their offspring and keep them in an atmosphere where virtue is likely to thrive. They should plant and water the seeds of modesty, piety, honesty, sobriety, truthfulness, obedience, and all the domestic and social virtues. They should instill into these young hearts religious sentiments, such as a love of prayer, reverence for what is holy, detestation of sin, respect for the Lord's day, the necessity of the Sacraments for right living, the importance of the Catechism and of advanced courses in Christian doctrine, the value of good books and the evil of bad ones; but above all a profound reverence for the Holy Scripture as interpreted by the infallible Church. If parents cannot impart religious instruction themselves, they are bound to procure it according to their means and their facilities.

PARENTS PIONEERS OF ALL UNIVERSITIES

For the fulfilment of duty God has given to parents the most wonderful educational talents. They do not need to take a course in pedagogy or hygiene or psychology. In this, as in similar cases, nature is a safer guide than art, and natural instincts succeed where artificial methods fail. The parental love and solicitude stamped upon the heart by the Creator, if not perverted by

vicious habits, are amply sufficient for practical purposes. God has infused into the hearts of parents an unspeakable tenderness for their offspring, an inexhaustible patience with their children's weaknesses, and unremitting watchfulness over their every movement. Who has taught the mother to enter into the very soul of her child, to read its thoughts and anticipate its wants, to interpret its inarticulate cry and to find music in sounds which are harsh to any but a mother's ear? Who is better adapted to make a deep and lasting impression on the tender heart of a child than the mother is? How often do we find that the lesson of a mother imparted in childhood, when recalled in later years to the mind of a wayward son, produces a result which no other motive can accomplish! There is no love like a mother's love, and no influence like a mother's influence. Her love is inexhaustible. It will pursue a wayward son or daughter to the ends of the earth and stand by them when they become outcasts from society, and their very name is a reproach among men. It is true that these natural gifts are not dispensed in equal measure to all parents, and that they can be wholly or partially eliminated by vicious habits; but this does not weaken the force of the general fact that the Creator intends parents to be the educators of their own children. As the parent is by Divine institution the natural educator of the child, so the child is the natural pupil of the parent. The family is a natural school with an inviolable charter written by the hand of God in the heart of parent and child. This school existed before all colleges and universities, and it will survive them all because it is part and parcel of human nature.

Therefore, whoever tampers with this Divine institution, thwarts the intentions of the Creator and violates the most sacred rights of parents and children. If parents have a strict duty to educate their children, they have also an inviolable right not to be hampered in the performance of that important duty. And if the children are bound by the law of nature to accept the education which their parents are in conscience obliged to give them, they have also the right to be unimpeded by intruders. Undue interference from any source whatsoever abridges the rights of parent and child.

HOW SCHOOLS FIRST CAME

Although the duty and right of parents to educate their offspring are undeniable, and though the obligation is personal, nevertheless they may invoke the aid of others in the discharge of that sacred trust. As parents can employ a worthy servant to nurse their children, so they can appoint a reliable teacher to superintend their physical, mental and moral development. Since it often happens that parents have not the time or knowledge necessary to give their children a complete education, it is perfectly natural that they should engage others to help them. But, as it would be very inconvenient and expensive, not to say impossible, for every family to provide a private tutor, and since one teacher can instruct many children in common, so several families may unite to secure the services of a common teacher. This need and consideration first gave rise to schools, which are nothing else but supplementary institutions to assist parents in the work of education. The teacher, then, holds a subsidiary office and possesses, in the natural order, just so much authority and jurisdiction as the parents choose to confer upon him. But like every other employe, he too may bargain with his employer. He can propose certain conditions on which alone his services are obtainable. Hence it is quite natural that schools, in the course of time, should acquire a certain degree of autonomy, and make regulations which parents must accept if they wish to secure the educational advantages to be found there. Yet, from the nature of things, schools must be ultimately at the mercy of parents; for, in the last analysis, parents have the right to decide whether they shall patronize such institutions or send their children to be educated elsewhere and otherwise.

THE STATE CAN GO SO FAR

What is the function of the State with reference to education? The State exists for the good of the individual and the family, and not the reverse. There is a tendency to exalt the State at the expense of its members, but that tendency is based on false philosophy and a wrong conception of life. The function of the State is to protect personal and domestic rights, and to promote the temporal

welfare of its citizens. Its scope is to secure by joint action what individual effort could not accomplish. Its function, therefore, is protective, supplementary and limited, not destructive and arbitrary. As the family preceded the State in point of time, so it has rights which the State neither gave nor can take away. That principle applies to education. The right to educate the child, as we have said, belongs to the parents, and no power on earth can take away that right even if the parents are utterly unfit to exercise it. In such a case they do not forfeit their natural right, though others may supply for their unfitness and incapacity. Apart from such extreme cases, parents should not be forced to send their children to any particular school. A State monopoly of education, to the exclusion of private schools and private tutors, is a violation of parental rights, and it practically denies freedom of worship. On the other hand, it would seem that the State can determine the minimum of education which is necessary for intelligent citizenship. It is not easy to define the limits of parental and State control in such matters, and so Catholic churchmen and Catholic statesmen disagree on the subject in detail.

POSSIBILITIES OF EXTREME LEGISLATION

The general tendency to absorb power, if not resisted, would beget undue interference on the part of the State. If the State may regulate the mental development of children in normal homes, why should it not superintend their physical growth? If it can supply the schoolmaster, why not the nurse? If it can prescribe the mental regime, why not also a physical? Why not enact a national bill of fare based on the most improved medical principles? Why not determine by legislation the material and the mode of dress, the kinds of food and the hours of meals, the time of rising and retiring, and, in fact, every detail of the household? Evidently, that would be intolerable interference with family life. Hence, there are, and there must be, limits to the powers of the State as touching the family. In the matter of education the State is rather a promoter and a patron than a pedagogue.

Parents should endeavor to make the home pleasant

and attractive. If the family circle be devoid of interest, the children will be tempted to seek abroad the pleasure which they ought to find at home. The younger children will be forced into the streets to mingle with the riff-raff of the town, and perhaps learn things which they should never know. The maturing girls will be inclined to make undesirable acquaintances or to attend performances of questionable propriety. The half-grown boys will be induced to herd with wild mates and become a nuisance at the best and a menace at the worst. If their imagination has been filled with fiction, they will try to imitate the exploits of fanciful heroes, and do wrongful or daring deeds to prove or develop their courage. They will go from bad to worse, and grow in malice as they grow in years.

THE IDEAL CHRISTIAN FAMILY

The father, the mother and the children make up that divine institution which is called the Christian family. The family is the most primitive society and the basis of all other societies. It comes straight from the hand of God with a thousand benedictions upon it. The young man and the young woman join hands before the altar, and in God's presence they promise mutual and perpetual truth and trust. Henceforth they belong to each other and to God. They have taken each other for better or for worse, in sickness or in health till parted by death. If their union be blessed with offspring, the father shares his earnings with his wife and children; the wife labors for all; the children look to their parents for support and protection. If prosperity visits them, they all rejoice in common and all share it alike. On the other hand, if adversity darkens their door, they meet it together and bear one another's burden. They are united by the bands of friendship and kinship, and they fight the battle for life shoulder to shoulder. The husband or father has to toil with his head or his hands; but the thought of his wife and children lessens his toil, and their warm welcome and their happy faces make him forget his weariness at the close of the day. Amid the monotony and drudgery of the household the wife and mother never loses sight of her plighted troth, and her love for her husband and children lightens the burdens and sweetens the bitterness

of life. Together they watch their children grow to maturity, happy, yet anxious, as if rejoicing in their own image yet fearful on account of the responsibility involved. Thus the little community lives through a generation till the children depart to found homes of their own. Happy are the parents who have brought up their children well, and whose children have been worthy of their training. Such children have been reared in a Catholic atmosphere; their pious mother taught their infant lips to pray; they have said family prayers night and morning; they have been sent to a Catholic school when it was possible to do so; they have studied their catechism, and perhaps have taken advanced courses in Christian doctrine; they have been taught from childhood to observe the proprieties and revere the sanctities of the home; they have acquired a taste for good books, or for music and embroidery, and they find at home that recreation and charm which others must seek abroad and seek in vain. In such an ideal God-fearing family the father and sons are not obliged to spend their evenings at a club in order to escape and forget the monotony and weariness of life.

AN APPEAL TO PARENTS

O Catholic Parents! your dignity is great, your mission is noble, and your influence is far-reaching; but bear in mind the while that your responsibility increases with your duties and your opportunities. It is true that you are mere instruments in the hands of God for the propagation of the race; but it is also true that you have wonderful power for good or evil, for weal or woe, for body and soul, for time and for eternity. You cannot create the soul of your child, but you can summon it fresh from the hand of its Maker, and you can send it back to Him made or marred forever. The house of clay which you build for the spirit of man is intended to become the temple of the Holy Ghost, as high above earthly temples as Heaven itself is above earth. Our proudest Cathedrals will sooner or later crumble into ruins, and their very names be forgotten; but the temple of the soul, though destined for the dust as a punishment of sin, will one day rise glorious and immortal from the dead—if your chil-

dren be saved. Your helpless babe is yet the masterpiece of the visible universe, because he bears within him what is poetically called "a spark of Divinity." In virtue of that spirit he is fearfully and wonderfully made; he is a little less than the angels, and is set over the lower orders of beings as their rightful lord and owner. The flowers of the meadow, the flocks of the field, the birds of the air, the footless herds of the deep, are all intended for him, to help him in his upward climb to Heaven. He may be surpassed by lesser things in some respects, as in point of strength or keenness of scent, or in range of vision; but in virtue of his intelligence he is monarch of all he surveys. He can control the most uncontrollable forces of nature, such as steam and electricity or explosives; he can harness the lightning and make it do his will; he can flash his messages to the ends of the earth with the speed of thought; he can annihilate space by telephone or telegraph or radio; in a word, his intelligence proves his lordship. He is but an atom of dust as compared to the earth, and infinitely less as contrasted with other planets, with the fixed stars and with the universe as a whole; yet he has within him a gift which enables him to number, weigh and measure them; to trace their orbits, to calculate their velocity, and to analyze their component parts. He can dip into the earth and bring forth its treasures, or soar among the clouds for good or evil purposes. He can wrest her secrets from nature, and use them for the benefit or the destruction of his fellow-men. In a word, he has great powers for good or ill, and the use or abuse of these powers depends much on his early training. The unspeakable havoc of the World War is due to false philosophy and godless education; and greater havoc still will come and come soon unless the proud sons of this world accept the principles of morality, truth and justice as explained and exemplified by the infallible Church of Christ. When men recognize the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, then, and only then, may we hope for lasting peace.

Even in the natural order man is the high-priest of creation, the spokesman of speechless things. The universe as a whole and in detail is intended mainly for God's extrinsic glory, but only intelligent beings like man

can fulfill that function. He is, or should be, a mediator between the irrational creature and the Creator, and his life should be a hymn of praise to his Maker. But in the supernatural order he is much more than that. Sanctifying grace makes him a partaker of the Divine Nature, a child of God and an heir of Heaven. Apart from sanctifying grace, man is only a creature of God, and, as such he is a servant; but in the order of grace he becomes an adopted child of God, and is destined to see his Heavenly Father face to face in the Beatific Vision. With all his gifts, natural and supernatural, with all his capabilities and destinies, the child is placed at the mercy of his parents, and woe betide the parents who are unfaithful to their sacred trust! Fathers and Mothers! you are training citizens not only for an earthly kingdom, but for the Kingdom of Heaven; you are preparing loyal subjects, not merely for an earthly monarch, but for the King of kings. Your work begins in time, but it will continue for all eternity. May you prove worthy of your noble mission, and enjoy with your offspring the reward of faithful service, the ineffable bliss of a glorious hereafter.

The State and the Family

DR. CYRIL FALLON

Reprinted from the Sydney "Freeman's Journal"

THERE are two views of the State—the material and the Christian. The material view looks upon the State as an agglomeration of individuals who are united together for the sake of advantage; in effect, the individual is the only reason for the existence of the State, and so the State can have no other duties than those which individuals give it. From this it is easy to understand the attitude of some politicians who regard as just and binding any law that has been passed by the State. The supremacy of the State becomes a fetish with them, and a majority decision is insisted upon, no matter how it may violate conscience, as a decree of ethical perfection. With a gradual but perceptible decay of Christian belief and practice in the community, this view of State supremacy is becoming dangerously more prevalent, and both individuals and

families hand over to a State as pagan as themselves rights which neither they have power to part with, nor the State to receive.

Summarizing the Christian view of the State, we find that the State as a natural institution, although permitted by the Divine will, cannot direct man to his supernatural end. That is the function of a supernatural institution, and the Church established by God is provided with the means for this purpose. The State, existing for the good of man, keeping his supernatural end in view, is obliged so to order society that no hindrance but rather assistance is given to enable man to achieve his destiny. Thus the State exists for man and not man for the State.

The rights inherent to man include:

(a) The right to live, involving the condemnation of craniotomy and abortion, the right of self-defense, and the right of maintaining life at a reasonable standard of comfort.

(b) The right to be educated, including religious, secular and technical training.

(c) The right to the enjoyment of liberty, with due regard to the liberty of others.

(d) The right to labor—that is, the right not to be impeded in the just or reasonable exercise of one's powers.

(e) The right to rest and recreation.

(f) The paramount right of man to perform his duties to his Creator—which means the right to follow conscience, "which is the only means of performing virtuous actions and so of tending towards our final destiny."

THE FAMILY

Without further elaboration of individual rights, we proceed to consider the true social unit, the Family. The Family we may define as the household group, consisting of father, mother, children, and other dependents. The family comes into existence in obedience to natural laws both physiological and psychological. Marriage according to Christian teaching is a Divine institution raised by Christ to the dignity of a Sacrament. It stands for unity and permanency. It is an indissoluble bond between husband and wife; upon its indissolubility depends its stability, upon its stability depends the preservation of society. Christianity raised woman from the position of a chattel or

a slave to one of honor. The family is in itself a perfect society, where the children owe obedience to the parents, the husband and wife mutual love and respect; where rights and duties are clearly indicated and Christianity demonstrates its destiny. In point of time the family is antecedent to the State, which exists for the benefit of the family. The primary purpose of the family is the propagation, perpetuation, and education of the race, but the State is called into being by moral and economic needs. The State is necessary to enable the family to develop fully its capacities, but without the family the State is impossible, for the State is at best only an aggregation of families. The family is self-contained, and should be inviolate from the State in the discharge of its inherent and moral duties. The children belong to the parents until they become adults, and not to the State. The natural ties of consanguinity and affection within the home are morally beyond the disruptive reach of the State. The parents are the natural educators of the children, and the State has no right whatever to take over the care of a child's education except in the event of parental inability or neglect. It follows that the State becomes unjust and tyrannical if, taking advantage of a parent's poverty, it insists upon an education which is alien from and inimical to the conscience of the parent. Likewise, if it unjustly discriminates in the distribution of public money for the purpose of education—giving an education which satisfies the conscience of one but which offends that of another, and penalizes the latter—the parent has the right to insist upon the priority of his right in the matter of educating his children over the State, to which he is antecedent and to which he cannot morally surrender his duty if by so doing he risks their moral welfare. This is clear enough to the Christian, who regards the State as existing for the individual and the family; it is not admitted by many materialists, who hold that the individual exists only for the State.

STATE ACTIVITY

Enough has been said to demonstrate the Christian outlook upon the State and the family. It remains for us to consider State activity as it affects or should affect

the welfare of the family—the real unit upon the integrity, stability, and perpetuation of which the continuity of the State depends. In our own days and country, citizens group themselves into classes and parties, with the object of securing control of the affairs of the State. It would not be fair to be scornful of surface reasons, the babble cries of parties, the inconsequential trivialities that appear to decide the fate of the State. The imprisonment or release of John Brown, the construction of bridges or a railway, the imposition of a tax, insinuations of public corruption, innuendoes of graft, demands for reduced taxation, shorter hours, cheaper food, etc.—all have their share at the hectic triennial carnival of electing the representatives of the people. It is possible to believe that these ferocious antagonists, in spite of violent differences of opinion upon these public matters, are nevertheless sound in principle, and clearly understand and accept the limitations of State authority. At any rate, it is our duty, before entrusting them with our individual authority to govern us, to be quite sure that they are definitely striving for the protection of the family—to provide such conditions and environment that it may develop along the lines of natural perfection with its inalienable rights sacred and inviolate. Having regard first for the family, the State is concerned with the removal of social evils which blight it. Society must be so ordered that the natural rights of man already referred to are preserved, but local circumstances seem to indicate that not sufficient thought is directed to the family rather than the individual as the unit. It cannot be denied that the man who occupies the lowest level—or even the average level, in the labor market, where he sells his labor for a price fixed by established tribunals, is placed in a very difficult position. In obedience to a natural law and with Divine sanction, and furthering the interests of the State, he becomes the head of a family. With more mouths to fill, bodies to clothe and shelter, with duties to discharge as a parent in relation to education, he finds his position too often exceedingly hard. What was sufficient for himself is hardly enough for a small family; for a large family it is cruelly inadequate. Is it necessary at this stage to labor the simple fact that the minimum laid down by regu-

lation as being sufficient for four, cannot by any process of reasoning be enough for more than four? If not, is it not opportune to ask, "Do the people entrusted with the control of the State realize they are perpetuating conditions fraught with the gravest danger?" They deliberately ignore the possibility, the hope, the fact that the human family contains more than two children. If a man may not steal, how is he to provide for his family? The loose answers of self-sufficient men of money that he should work harder, be ambitious, alert; that he is poor because he is lazy, listless, intemperate, or stupid, are answers of callousness and of ignorance. It is untrue that the average man is not eager to work to provide for his family, it is also false that he is intemperate; but it is true that while the present system or any system of paying wages exists, the great majority will be engaged in work that can only entitle them to the minimum rate. The present minimum for a larger family is a rate of poverty. Without entering into the question of Capital and Labor, we can at least declare that the State which permits existing conditions to endure is bound to see that the interests of the family do not suffer.

Catholic Parents and the Catholic School

THE one school good enough for the Catholic child is the Catholic school. It is not claimed that every one of its pupils will turn out a Saint and a scholar. Even the school conducted by our Blessed Lord Himself has a representative in Hell. What is asserted with confidence is that the Catholic school alone strives to give the child an adequate education in religion and morality, that it uses the means approved by centuries of experience in training him to avoid what is evil and embrace what is good, and that its efforts are largely successful. Of no other system of education can these assertions be made.

For the Catholic school alone consistently holds that education must prepare the child for citizenship in the world to come as well as for a place in this world that is a fleeting show. The fundamental difference between the Catholic and the secular system may be easily stated. The Catholic school teaches that man's first and supreme allegiance is to Almighty God and believes that if the child is trained to realize this allegiance, the citizen will not fail in his duty to himself, his fellows, or the State. The secular school, on the other hand, teaches that it knows and can know nothing of Almighty God; and that, by consequence, supernatural religion, and morality based upon it, can have no legitimate place in education.

Because the Catholic Church anathematizes secularism, as every believer in supernatural religion must, she will not permit her children to be exposed to the perils of the secular school. Hence she provides parish schools wherever possible, so that Catholic parents may have the assistance, today morally indispensable, of teachers who will give their children a Christian education. If the Church's legislation seems peremptory, it is because she must be faithful to the command of her Divine Founder, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not." Hence after stating the duty of parents to provide for the education of their children (Canon 1113) the Church decrees in Canon 1372:

Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral, or

mixed schools; that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics. It is for the Bishop of the place alone to decide, according to the instructions of the Apostolic See, in what circumstances and with what precautions attendance at such schools may be tolerated without danger of perversion to the pupils.

For Catholics discussion is at an end. "It is the duty of all to speak sound doctrine on this subject," wrote the late Bishop McQuaide, that valiant champion of the Catholic school, "precisely as the Holy See announces it. It is a betrayal of God's sacred cause to neglect this duty. He who denies the Church's teaching on one point, whether that denial be in the spirit or the letter, prepares himself to deny it on the other points that clash with his notions of what the truth should be." And the last truth in this matter is, that *unless the Bishop has given his permission* no Catholic may entrust his child to any school but a Catholic school.

Some Results from Catholic Schools

Reprinted from the Record, July 23, 1925.

Many Catholics have the impression that our Catholic parish schools are a sort of a makeshift and are not to be compared in points of efficiency to State supported schools. This impression must prevail to a greater extent among non-Catholics, and that, too, is a matter of some concern as it tends to prevent a full measure of cordial relations which we would like to see manifested among all citizens irrespective of their religious belief.

Of course, it stands to reason that our Catholic teachers who give their entire lives to the instruction of youth, without having any business engagements, social ambitions, or family ties to divide their interests, are naturally not less devoted to and not less competent to judge of the welfare of the youth than teachers who take up their task only until something more attractive is offered.

But our practical turn of mind in this modern age is not much impressed by abstract theories. We clamor for results. We gauge the value of almost everything by a few facts which come within our limited observation. For this reason, the *Record* welcomes the opportunity to

reproduce the results of some recent contests conducted in various parts of the country and all over the country, which show that our parochial schools do not suffer by comparison with other schools. In the majority of cases where the pupils of parochial schools are entered in a contest with other schools, the result is a victory for Catholic schools. A number of such contests with their results have been collected by *Our Sunday Visitor* and are given below:

Washington, D. C., June, 1925.—Frank Neuhauser, eleven years of age, pupil of St. Brigid's parochial school, Louisville, Ky., won the nation-wide spelling bee conducted by the Louisville *Courier-Journal* in which more than two million public and parochial school children participated. The prize was a gold medal and \$1,000.

Philadelphia, Pa., May, 1925.—Albert William Schneider, thirteen years old, pupil of St. Bonaventura's parish school, Philadelphia, and Edward Dougherty, thirteen years old, pupil of Our Lady of Rosary parochial school, Philadelphia, respectively, won first and second prize in the "Boy Week" contest conducted by the Safety Council of Philadelphia.

Brooklyn, N. Y., May, 1925.—Matthew P. Kelly, student in the high school of the College of the Immaculate Conception, Brooklyn, won the contest for the Brooklyn District of the National Oratorical Contest on the Constitution, in which six public high schools took part.

Rochester, N. Y., June, 1925.—Miss Helen M. Ritz, a graduate from Nazareth Academy, heads the list of university scholarship winners conducted by the State Department of Education, her average being 97.57. Nazareth Academy pupils won twelve out of the twenty-five scholarships awarded in this county.

Buffalo, N. Y., April, 1925.—Francis P. Schlageter of Canisius Catholic High School, this city, won first place in the grand finale for Western New York in the National Oratorical Contest.

Topeka, Kan., May, 1925.—Robert Fox, Jr., of the Topeka Catholic High School won the State High School Oratorical Contest held in Manhattan, Kan.

Los Angeles, April, 1925.—Eugene F. McElnell of Loyola College, Los Angeles, was awarded first prize in

the Los Angeles *Times* National Oratorical Contest on the Constitution.

Helena, Mont., May, 1925.—For the third consecutive year, Mount St. Charles College, Helena, Montana, has won first place in the annual Inter-Collegiate Oratorical Contest in the State of Montana.

Cleveland, Ohio, March, 1925.—In the Flag Story Contest conducted here by the Western Reserve Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, all of the sixteen prizes offered in the eleventh and twelfth grade of school children were won by children from the Catholic schools, and the first prize in the fifth and sixth grades also went to pupils from a Catholic school.

Frostburg, Md., November, 1924.—Mary McGraw, fifteen, student at St. Michael's High School, won first prize in the High School Department in the Essay Contest held for the students of this town by a national advertising agency.

Brooklyn, N. Y., November, 1924.—Dorothy Gallagher, graduate from Our Lady of Sorrows Academy, was awarded first prize for Queens County and second prize for the State of New York in the American Legion Washington Essay Contest.

Brooklyn, N. Y., May, 1925.—Charles F. Murphy of Fordham University won first prize in the Intercollegiate Extempore Speaking Contest. Second and third prizes respectively were won by students of Dartmouth and Pennsylvania Colleges.

Washington, D. C., February, 1925.—Two of Mr. J. W. Brady's children of 818 Farragut St., Northwest, won first and second prizes respectively in the Home Lighting Contest conducted here. Robert Brady is a student at St. John's College and Francis Brady is a student at Notre Dame Academy.

Lowell, Mass., April, 1925.—First prize in the Lowell Day Essay Contest has been awarded to Mary McClusky, a pupil of St. Michael's school, in the annual contest for all public and parochial school children conducted by the Lowell Chamber of Commerce.

Omaha, Neb., July, 1925.—Antoinette Lococo, of the Catholic Cathedral High School, was awarded first prize in the Essay Contest on "The Federal Constitution and

the Courts," being conducted by the Nebraska State Bar Association for public and parochial schools of Nebraska.

Indianapolis, Ind., May, 1925.—Robert Krumholtz, Catholic High school student of Springfield, O., won first prize of 750 in the American Legion Nation Wide Essay Contest on "Why Communism Is a Menace to Americanism."

Brooklyn, N. Y., June, 1925.—In the Essay Contest on "Toledo" conducted by the Harry Wolkoff Association for Brooklyn school children, the first three prizes were won respectively by Lora Haynes of the Nativity Parochial School, Rita McCoy of St. Anthony's School, and Henry Drachbar of Our Lady of Lourdes School.

Washington, D. C., April, 1925.—Frances B. French of Elizabeth, N. J., won first prize in the Third National Safety Campaign Essay Contest over 400,000 other competitors from public and parochial schools of the country conducted by the Highway Education Board with headquarters here

New York, April, 1925.—Miss Adelaide Rose Cahill of 580 West 161st Street, New York, won first prize for an essay on Home Lighting in a competition with 500,000 school children in the New York, Long Island and Westchester section of the National Essay Contest.

Cleveland, O., January, 1925.—Sister Mary Paul Johnson of St. Vincent's Charity Hospital in this city led a class of thirty in a test held by the State Board of Pharmacy.

Denver, Col., May 1925.—Sister Mary Aquin, Superior of Mount Alverna Convent in this city, won the first prize in the news item slogan contest held for the beautification of Denver.

Detroit, Mich., April, 1925.—Miss Mary McGillivray, graduate of St. Mary's Academy, was awarded first prize by the American Legion for the best essay from the State of Michigan on "Why Communism Is a Menace to Americanism."

Washington, D. C., May, 1925.—Of twelve awards just announced in the American Chemical Society's Evolution Contest in the District of Columbia, seven were captured by pupils of parochial schools of this city.

It will be noted that all of the above occurred within

the past few months. Some three years ago the Editor of the *Record* took occasion to collect a similar list of contests which came under his notice in 1921 and 1922. This list, like the one above, is by no means complete, as in neither instance was the canvass of societies a systematic one, but it is given below as an indication that the excellent showing made in the number of contest set out above is not an exceptional thing or due to any sudden spurt of interest in Catholic educational circles.

New Orleans, May, 1921.—Catholic schools won all six prizes in the Annual Essay Contest of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

St. Louis, June, 1921.—Catholic high school is awarded first prize for best essay on the Merchant Marine.

Rochester, N. Y., August, 1921.—The first six of twenty-five scholarships offered by the State Department of Education were won by students of Nazareth Academy, this county.

Niagara Falls, September, 1921.—A Catholic school pupil of Minneapolis won the world's championship in shorthand competition conducted by the National Reporters Association.

Charleston, S. C., July, 1922.—Students of the Bishop England Catholic High School won both prizes offered by the Daughters of the Confederacy for the best essay on Ann Cunningham who saved Mount Vernon as a national shrine.

In the George Washington Essay Contest conducted in 1922 by the *Daily News* of New York both the first prize of \$1,000 and the second of \$500 were won by Catholic school pupils, and thirteen of twenty-five \$500 prizes also went to Catholic school pupils.

In the 1922 State Oratorical Contest for Montana first honors were awarded to a student at St. Charles College, Helena.

In a Music Memory Contest in 1922 by the Cleveland Orchestra, first prize was won by Lourdes Academy and second by the Catholic Girls' High School of Cleveland.

In the War Department's Contest for the best essay on "The Benefits of Enlistment in the United States Army," a pupil of Notre Dame Parochial School, Washington, D. C., won first prize.

The Chicago *Tribune* of March, 1922, carried the following news item: "Two hundred pupils from 15 schools were represented in a spelling bee held in the Cicero School Saturday. Thirteen of the schools were public and two parochial. The winners of the contest were all from the parochial schools."

In the Carnegie Oratorical Contest conducted in 1922 in the Maryland District of Columbia District, where most of the schools of high learning competed, John Hopkins University among them, the two Catholic Schools participating, Loyola University of Baltimore and Georgetown University of Washington, finished first and second, respectively. In Pennsylvania another Jesuit College, St. Joseph's, won first honors. Two Catholic schools, Boston College and Holy Cross, entered the Massachusetts competition, against Harvard and other famous Bay State educational institutions; Boston College finished first and Holy Cross second. In Missouri, St. Louis University, the only Catholic entry, was awarded the highest honor. Boston College, conducted by the Jesuits, eliminated all contenders in the finals and won the national contest.